

Appl. No. : 10/882,001
Filed : June 29, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

Amendments to the Claims and Specification

Claims 1, have been amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

Newly Added

New claims have been added.

Specification

The Examiner objected to “greater than 20% water” as new matter. The limitation of “greater than 20% water” in Claims 1, 65, and 66 has been cancelled and replaced by “57.5% or greater water” in Claims 1, 65, and 66. Support for this limitation is found in Table I, Example A (84.5% water), Example C (83.7% water), Example D (71.9% water) and Table II, Example F (57.5% water) and Example I (74% water).

Claim Objections

Claims 8-23 and 25-37 were objected to because of there dependence upon cancelled Claim 2. These Claims have been amended to depend upon Claim 1. Claims 10 and 27 have been cancelled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 6, 10, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as confusing because the composition has greater than 20% water (now 57.5% or greater water), yet the composition is dry to the touch and has effervescent activity when combined with water. Claims 10 and 27 referring to effervescent activity have been cancelled. Claim 65 has been amended with the limitation “wherein said cleaning pad is substantially dry-to-the-touch”. The Examiner

Appl. No. : 10/882,001
Filed : June 29, 2004

maintains that it is confusing that a composition has greater than 20% water (now 57.5% or greater water), yet the composition is dry to the touch. The Applicant points out that the cleaning pad is substantially dry-to-the-touch, and not the cleaning composition. "Dry-to-the-touch" is defined in paragraph 119 of the specification. It is a property of the cleaning pad or substrate and differs from prior art substrates that either contain substantially less water or that contain visible liquid on the outside of the substrate and drip under gravity without externally applied pressure.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 20, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38-40, 43, 44, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kott et al. (US 6,303,556).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of 2% or more fragrance. Koch does not teach 2% or more fragrance. Therefore, Koch does not anticipate Claim 1. Claims 65 and 66 have been similarly amended. Claims 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 20, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38-40, 43, and 44 are dependent on Claim 1. Therefore, Koch does not anticipate Claims 8, 9, 12-16, 18, 20, 26, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38-40, 43, and 44.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barnabas et al. (US 6,814,088). Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of 4 to 60% carboxylic acid. Therefore, Barnabas does not anticipate Claim 1. Claims 3-4, 9, 12, and 13 are dependent on Claim 1. Therefore, Barnabas does not anticipate Claims 3-4, 9, 12, and 13. Accordingly, the objection to Claims 1, 3-4, 9, 12, and 13 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11-23, 26, 28, 30-46, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kott et al. (US 6,303,556). Kott requires that the cleaning composition comprise modified alkylbenzene sulfonate to enhance the tolerance of the system to hardness. Amended Claim 1 requires that the composition does not contain alkylbenzene sulfonate surfactant. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 11-23, 26, 28, 30-46 depend upon Claim 1. Amended Claims 65 and 66 require that the cleaning pad is substantially dry-to-the-touch. Kott does not teach a cleaning pad that is substantially dry-to-the-touch. Accordingly, the objection to Claims 1,

Appl. No. : 10/882,001
Filed : June 29, 2004

3, 4, 8, 9, 11-23, 26, 28, 30-46, 65 and 66 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-23, 26, 28-46, 65 and 66 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kott et al. (US 6,303,556) in view of Sherry (US 6,716,805). As described above Kott does not anticipate amended Claims 1, 65, and 66 and neither Kott nor Sherry teach all the limitations of these claims. Therefore, the objection to Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11-23, 26, 28-46, 65 and 66 is overcome and it is respectfully urged that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If, however, some issue remains which the Examiner feels may be addressed by Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Please charge any additional fees, including fees for additional extensions of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03 2270.

Respectfully submitted,
The Clorox Company
Customer No. 27019

Dated: July 6, 2006

By: /David Peterson/
David Peterson
Registration No. 37909
Attorney of Record
The Clorox Company
(510) 271-7521